

LIVERPOOL CLASSICAL MONTHLY (LCM) Vol. 13 No 1 January 1988

Edited, printed and published at Liverpool
 by Dr J.Pinsent & Ms Helena Hurt, BA
 Dept of Classics and Archaeology
 The University,
 P.O. Box 147 Liverpool, L69 3BX,
 RATES for 1988, 10 issues (not August and September)
 SURFACE £8.50 UK, £9.50 Europe, \$(US)17.50 elsewhere
 AIR £10 Europe, \$(US)27.50 N.America, \$(US)35 Australasia.



CONTENTS, of which the authors retain the copyright

The Editor retains copyright in the format

J.PINSENT (Liverpool): <i>Notes on Livy 6 (1.1)</i>	2-6
JOHN GLUCKER (Tel Aviv): <i>As has been rightly said . . . by me</i>	6-9
ROBERT PARKER (Oriental College, Oxford): <i>Were Spartan kings heroized?</i>	9-10
H.D.JOCelyn (Manchester): <i>Valerius Flaccus and Ennius</i>	10-11
Review: W.GEOFFREY ARNOTT (Leeds)	11-13
Graham Zanker, <i>Realism in Alexandrian poetry: a literature and its audience</i> . London /Sydney/Wolfeboro N.H., Croom Helm, 1987. Pp.vi + 250. Cloth, £29.95. ISBN 0-7099-3055-4	
Reviews: GILLIAN CLARK (Liverpool): <i>'Sex and violence'</i>	14-16
Nicole Loraux, <i>Tragic ways of killing a woman</i> , edited and translated by Anthony Forster, Cambridge, Mass., and London, Harvard U.P. 1987. Pp.xii + 100. ISBN 0-674-90225-4	
Michael B.Poliakoff, <i>Combat Sports in the Ancient World: competition, violence and culture</i> . Sport and History Series, New Haven & London, Yale U.P. Pp.xvi + 202, cloth, £16.95, \$30.00. ISBN 0-300-03768-6.	
D.N.LEVIN (Rice U. Houston): <i>Horace, Carm. 3.1.42 again</i>	16

This number of *LCM*, the first of the new volume, accompanies, at least for those who are not in arrears for 1987 or even longer, who will not receive it until they clear those arrears and renew, with remittance, for 1988, the last of the previous year. The Editor apologizes for the hiccups that have been experienced during that year, hopes that subscribers appreciate their cause, welcome both the new format (as he has evidence that some at least do) and the increased business efficiency of *LCM*, and will bear with him until the timetable of production settles down. One cause has not before been mentioned. Those previous numbers of which the masters were prepared on Laserwriter made use of that possessed by ULTRA (for explanation of this acronym see the Editor's notes for last October), which generously permitted its use. But *LCM* had found before that there is no substitute for owning your own equipment, which is available for your use when you want it, and which permits control and experiment. SO, we bought a Laserwriter Plus, on which these are the first numbers of which the masters have been prepared. Readers will notice its effect on the Greek font, which has previously been criticized. Moreover the use of MacPlus also makes proofing easier, and the EA no longer permits the Editor's earlier and cavalier attitude to the text.

The Editor used once (but not since 1978) to use the last number of the year to 're-affirm the principles' upon which *LCM* is run. In January 1981 he even published an account of the first 'Five years of *LCM*', but this was not followed in 1986 by 'Ten years of *LCM*', and readers will have to wait until 1991 for 'Fifteen years of *LCM*' (if the Editor is spared that long). He can, however, add a note to the archaeology of *LCM*, thanks to the good records of its first subscriber and contributor, Professor Wiseman, who informed him on 11.4.83 that 'I did "Minucius and the Porta Trigemina" for Harold Mattingly's Leeds Seminar on May 7th 1975. An eight month pregnancy, if that was [as it was] the date of conception! Why not consult an astrologer & have the horoscope drawn? cf Tarutius in Plut. *Rom.*12'. This letter may count as Professor Wiseman's contribution to the first number of the year.

That of the Editor is one of the firstfruits of the new unified Department, being on Livy 6, and indicating that he now feels free to resume work on his long projected continuation of the commentary of R.M.Ogilvie. He last published on Livy, at the instance of Professor Skutsch, in

LCM of January 1977, for, despite a Liverpool tradition of writing outside your Department (Professor A.Y.Campbell as Professor of Greek devoting much of his time to improving Horace and Professor Walbank writing of the Greek historian Polybius while in the Department of Latin), he was very conscious of an attitude, which goes back to the separation of the Departments here in 1965, that a member of the Greek Department should devote himself to Greek. Now, *rara temporum felicitate ubi sentire quae velis et quae sentias dicere licet*, he happily returns to his original love in order also to demonstrate that 'Latin at Liverpool' continues to flourish.

Principles. Some readers may have hoped for trenchant comments on the 'Barron report' and some indication of the way in which it has been received in Classics Departments throughout the country, with news of projected movements. But LCM, while regretting the lack of publicity given these matters, does not print gossip, of which he gathers a good deal, and only reports changes with the written consent of the University authorities concerned. No Spycatcher, the Editor retains old-

fashioned views on confidentiality, and so reverts to signing himself



J.PINSENT (Liverpool): *Notes on Livy 6.(1.1)*

LCM 13.1 (Jan.1988), 2-6

These notes, the first draft of the projected continuation of R.M.Ogilvie's great commentary on 1-5 to which I am now returning, were written in 1970 in the Papyrological Seminar of the Library of the University of Michigan, under the benevolent gaze of the late Professor Youtie, whose tentative attempts to turn me into a papyrologist did not divert me from my purpose. Their publication is some return for the hospitality I then received as Visiting Professor in the Department of History, and enables me to express my gratitude for the opportunity I then had to study Livy.

Livy's treatment in Book 6, as indeed throughout his history, is basically annalistic, and some of the years are only briefly noted in the archival style, e.g. 387, 5.6-6.2; 383, 21.1-9; 382, 22.1-4; 379, 30.1-9; 378, 31.1 - 32.2 (somewhat written-up); 377, 32.3 - 33.12 (even more so); 370, 36.1-6. The division between *externa* and *domestica* is generally observed, and in some years one or the other is treated archivally (*domestica* 4.4-6; *externa* 42.4-8, with possible source change). But this distinction is only one of subject matter and its treatment. For the original context of *externa* is the report to the Senate by those who have been occupied there of what they have done or are doing, and this is why, particularly in the later decades where Livy is following Polybius and others, the structure of the narrative appears to separate chunks of archival material covering the end of one year and the beginning of the next with long passages of *externa* derived from other sources.

But three kinds of events are dealt with in very much greater detail, and might be considered as themes of the book¹. These are: (1) the exploits of Camillus in 389, 2.1 - 4.3, in 386, 6.3 - 10.6, and in 381, 22.5 - 25.8, 3 of the 4 years in which he was either *dictator* or *tribunus militum*. In these years he is given set-piece battles, including in 386 a detailed mobilization; (2) the *Manliana seditio* in 385, 11.1 - 10 & 14.1 - 17.6, and in 384, when it is the only event mentioned, 18.1 - 20.16; (3) the Licinian-Sextian *seditio*, in 377, 34.1 - 35.10, in 369, 36.7-12, and in 368, 38.1 - 42.2. A fourth also runs through the book, Roman dealing with the Latins, about which short, semi-archival notes are inserted in some years, in 389, 6.2; in 386, 10.7-9; in 385, 17.7-8; in 383, 21.1-9; in 382, 22.1-4; in 380, 27.1 - 28.3 (written up and leading to a Quinctian dictatorship at 28.4 - 29.10); in 377, 32.3 - 33.12.

Book 6 covers the period between the Sack and the First Plebeian Consulship: the latter can be regarded as the restoration of the consulship after 74 years of almost uninterrupted military tribunates. These two dates were important in Roman chronology and historiography, the Sack for itself, and perhaps also for the *anno urbis* in which it occurred, the latter because the consular *fasti* from that year provided a firm sequence of years down to events which could be accurately

¹ cf. R.M.Ogilvie, *A Commentary on Livy Books 1-5*, Oxford 1965 [hereafter RMO], 18: 'Livy constructs a series of episodes round a moral theme'; 30, where he identifies the themes which 'form the dominant threads in the later four books', *libertas* in 2, *moderatio* in 3 [cf. 390], *modestia* in 4 and *pietas* in 5. But this type of analysis is not entirely applicable to books 6-10, where the factual material largely determines its own treatment.

ted into the dating schemes of the Mediterranean world².

The college of military tribunes of the year of the Sack was known to be that of three Fabii (5.36.12) with Sulpicius, Servilius and Cornelius. But Diodorus, 14.110, only names one Fabius, Kaeso, though he says there were 6 *tribuni*, as he does at 15.20.1 when he repeats the college exactly, only this time calling the Fabius Gaius. Neither Livy nor any other source ever names three Fabii³ and it must be suspected that the college was originally one of four, Kaeso and Gaius being the expansion of an abbreviation variously read as K and C, but which was probably originally K., and that the addition of two more Fabii was the invention of Fabius Pictor, to which, and to theories of the size of the college, Diodorus pays lip service with his 'six'.

Roman historians gave a number of different intervals between the Sack and the Restoration of the Consulship. The earliest interval seems to have been that of 18 years, the number of colleges of Military Tribunes that were actually preserved. It survives in Diodorus, who repeats the college of the Sack in his year 381 (15.20.1), though he tells the story in his year 386, the first time he gives the college. But a tradition of a year of anarchy was so strong as to cause the interval to be made up of only 17 colleges and a year of anarchy: so both Livy and Diodorus omit one of the colleges, Livy that immediately before and Diodorus the last before the Restoration.

But the date of Sack was also given by interval dates between the various Gallic incursions down to the peace of 282, which was tied to a Greek synchronism (Polybius 2.18.6 - 20.6: Fabius). In this way Fabius dated the sack to 384, which gave him an interval of 22 years⁴, which he probably filled by extending the anarchy to four years, as did the sources behind Dio (Zonaras 7.24), Cassiodorus, Eutropius and the *Fasti Hydatini*.

Livy, however, has 5 years *solitudo magistratuum* (6.35.10), giving an interval of 23 years and a date for the Sack of 385. This is A.U.C. 365, as Livy says in the speech of Camillus at 5.54.5. It is not clear how Livy extended his *Fasti* for the period before the Sack in order to make that college the 365th instead of the 364th. It was not, as Werner⁵, by counting as two years both the Military Tribunes of 444 and the consuls given by Licinius Macer, for he is explicit that the consuls were suffect (4.7.11 & 8.1), and he may not have extended them at all. For both for Livy and apparently for Diodorus, the Sack, a key date, seems to have marked a source change (probably to Claudius Quadrigarius, who only began, it seems, his history in that year, see on 6.1.2). And the date 385 is implied by the *fasti* of Book 6: for Livy's omission of the college of 376V is deliberate, and must not be taken to imply 6 years' anarchy and an interval of 24 years between the Sack and the Restoration⁶.

The year A.U.C. 365 may well in fact have been selected for its mystical significance as a Great Year⁷. The Camillan passages in Livy have an Augustan as well as a Caesarian colour (e.g. 5.49.7 *Romulus ac parens patriae conditorque alter urbis*), and Books 1-5 may have been designed to be published in advance as part of the propaganda build-up for a celebration of the

² These matters, and what follows on the dating of the Sack, are argued in greater detail in my *Military Tribunes and Plebeian Consuls: the Fasti from 444V to 342V*, *Historia Einzelschrift* 24, Wiesbaden 1975, esp. ch.4. (critically reviewed by A.Drummond, *JRS* 68 [1978], 187-8), which represents a later stage of the argument than what is published here.

³ 5.36.5 *legati tres M.Fabii Ambusti*; 36.11 *cum tribus Fabiis*. The supplements [Q.Fabius] in the Capitoline *Fasti* and Q.[Fabius] in *CIL VI.37161* seem groundless: the former could be K. or C. and the latter [Servilius], who in Livy follows Q.Sulpicius Longus of whose name the Longus is preserved in the inscription.

⁴ All Roman annalists put the Restoration in 362: it was raised to 366 when Varro, whose chronology lies behind the Capitoline *Fasti*, extended the consul list by the four 'Dictator Years'. But see also *Military Tribunes* ch.2.

⁵ R.Werner, *Der Beginn der römischen Republik (BRR)*, Munich 1963, 145.

⁶ The theory of Niccolini and Leuze, cf. *MRR* 1.109 n.2)

⁷ J.Hubaux, first in *Les grands mythes de Rome*, Paris 1945, 146; cf. *Rome et Véies*, Paris 1958, 38: accepted by R.Merkelbach, *MusHelv* 18 (1961), 92. Contra, R.Werner (above n.5) 149 n.1; J.Bayet, *Livy 5* (Budé), Paris 1954, 104. The theory is supported by the reference to *Iuventas* in the same Camillan speech at 5.54.7, cf. *RMO* ad loc..

Secular Games in 23, an inference first made by Hirschfeld⁸ from those of Domitian in A.D.88. The Augustan re-settlement of 23 might indeed have been originally planned to coincide, and to provide constitutional evidence of this, the third, foundation of Rome (cf. 7.1.10). If so, the date 385, and the 5th year of the anarchy, may be Livy's own.

6.1.1-13. Livy introduces the second pentad with a brief preface. A long single sentence sums up the theme of the preceding first pentad, admitting how uncertain was the information it had contained. 6.1.1. *ab condita urbe Roman ad captam eandem urbem*. Virtually an A.U.C. dating, like 1.60.3 *regnatum Romae ab condita urbe ad liberatam annos ducentos quadraginta quattuor*, its closest parallel. But here the number of years is omitted, unless they are to be understood from 5.54.5 *trecentessimus sexagesimus quintus annus urbis*.

A.U.C. dating is a genuine form of era dating (W.Kubitschek, *RE* 1.1 [1893], 622; contra, E.Bickerman, *Chronology*, 1968, 75 & 77). Era dating was a Hellenistic invention, apparently first used for the Seleucids, which was introduced to Rome by late Republican antiquarians (Cicero, *Brut.* 72, 46 B. C., *Fam.* 9.1.1 & 21.2; Pliny, *NH* 18, source list; Plutarch, *Rom.* 12; F.Münzer, *Hermes* 40 [1905], 55) and adopted in the Capitoline Fasti.

But these use 752 and not the Varronian 753 as the Foundation date, reducing the regal period from 244 to 243 years, though they follow the Varronian consular chronology. For Werner, *BRR* 197, they are following an earlier chronological tradition (source?) for the regal period: for O.Leuze, *Die römische Jahrzahlung*, Tübingen 1909, 251, they equated the first consular year, probably taken as beginning on Jan.1 rather than Mar.1, with the A.U.C. year (beginning Apr.21) in which the consuls were supposed to have taken office rather than with that in which most of their year fell: he supposed that they simply reduced the reign of Tarquinius Superbus from 25 years to 24 (so Eutropius 1.8). Leuze opposes the differing assumptions of Mommsen, Soltau and Holzappel (which he cites on p.254) about *interregna* and regnal lengths.

Whatever the method by which the Capitoline Fasti reduced the length of the regal period it seems possible that they too were influenced by the millenary chronology which lies behind 5.54.5 and which put either the Sack or the Second Foundation of Rome in A.U.C. 365 (see above).

These overtones of A.U.C.dating may help to explain why Livy particularly uses it for constitutional changes, as from kings to consuls (1.60.3 *regnatum Romae ab condita urbe ad liberatam annos ducentos quadraginta quattuor*), from consuls to decemvirs (3.33.1 *anno trecentesimo altero quam condita Roma erat*; RMO 455), from consuls to military tribunes (4.7.1 *anno trecentesimo decimo quam urbs Roma condita erat*) and for the election of two patrician consuls (7.18.1 *quadringentesimo anno quam urbs Romana condita erat*).

But it is also used for the declaration of the Macedonian War in 200 (31.5.1) probably to mark the beginning of a new Decade of the History, even though, in order to end Books 21-30 with Scipio the year-end archival for 201 is carried over into the 4th decade (31.1-4). Here Livy also gives an A.U.C. date for the beginning of the First Punic War, which appears in Eutropius at 1.18 and not with that for the Macedonian War, which is at 4.2. It is therefore likely that it appeared in Livy first at the beginning of Book 16. If so, Livy used A.U.C. dates to signal significant divisions of his work, the beginning of the Republic at the end of Book 1, the Sack of Rome at the end of Book 5, the beginning of the 10 books dealing with the conquest of Italy⁹ at the beginning of Book 6, the beginning of 15 books of Punic Wars, with only a minor and undated division at Book 21, at the beginning of Book 16, and the beginning of the 4th decade at the beginning of Book 31. The economy of the later books is less clear, but an A.U.C. date was given for the Third Punic War at the beginning of Book 49 (*Periiocha* 49; Eutropius 4.10), and in that same book, on the occasion of a celebration of the Secular Games which Livy assigns to 149, an A.U.C. date was given for the first celebration 249. As in the case of the beginning of the First Punic War, it is likely that this A.U.C. date had also been given in Book 19.

Livy has a number of other references to years A.U.C., most of which have probably been rounded off, but some of which might reflect different dates for the Foundation of Rome. They are: 5.40.1 *urbis per trecentos sexaginta annos omnibus bellis victricis*, cf. Plutarch, *Cam.* 22.2

⁸O.Hirschfeld, *Wiener Studien* 3 (1881), 102.

⁹Eutropius 1.18 *cum iam clarum urbis Romae nomen esset, arma tamen extra Italiam mota non fuerunt*: the phrase *quamquam a condita urbe nunquam bella cessassent* may also be Livian.

ἐξήκοντα καὶ τριακοσίων ἐτῶν πλείονα βράχυν χρόνον ; there are ideological overtones in the phrase *urbs victrix* cf. 5.24.10 & 30.3 *victrici patriae*, 38.50.8 *Roma victrix*, 5.7.10 *beatam urbem Romanam et invictam et aeternam*, 7.10.4 *nomen Romanum invictum*, 8.34.2 *imperium invictum populi Romani praesta*, 9.17.4 *praestant invictum Romanum imperium*, 30.42.16 *populum Romanum eo invictum esse*. The contexts of all these uses merit examination.

5.45.4 *urbis iam prope quadringentensimum annum vicinae*

7.33.6 *Romanis contra quadringentorum annorum decora et conditae urbi aequalis victoria*, cf. 32.8 *quid autem esse duo prospera in tot saeculis bella Samnitium adversus tot decora populi Romani, qui triumphos paene plures quam annos ab urbe condita numeret*. Livy in fact signals the beginning of the Samnite Wars in this year with a special preface, 7.29.1-2, which has echoes of the Preface to the whole History: with *ut in hanc magnitudinem quae vix sustinetur erigi imperium posset* cf. 1 pr.4 *ut iam magnitudine labore*¹⁰.

Livy also notes the 3rd (7.2.3.) and 5th (8.25.1) *lectisternia* as *post conditam urbem*, but not the 4th (7.27.1) or any subsequent, and he has no record of the 2nd. He also notes the 10th *lustrum* as *ab origine urbis* (3.24.7), but reckons the 20th *a primis censoribus* (10.47.3, cf. 3.30.7 *tricesimo sexto anno a primis tribunis plebis*).

An era *post reges exactos* may also be recognized: at 7.3.8 there is a reference to M. Horatius dedicating the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus *anno post reges exactos*, and there are three such references in the speech of Canuleius¹¹ (4.3.14 *Claudiam certe gentem post reges exactos*, 4.4.1 *at enim nemo post reges exactos de plebe consul fuit*, 4.4.7 *aut ab regibus legi aut post reges exactos iussu populi*; cf. 4.15.3 *ex qua urbe reges exactos*, 10.9.3 *tertio ea* [sc. *lex de provocatione*] *tum post reges exactos lata est*.

All these references are to the period immediately after the expulsion (10.9.3 looks back to the first Valerian law *de provocatione*), as are similar references in other authors (Cicero, *Brut.* 62 *anno decimo post reges expulsos*; Asconius *Corn.* 67) *anno XVI post reges exactos*; Dionysius 7.1.5 in a dating sequence with an Olympiad dating and an Athenian archon and a context in which he refers to Licinius and Gellius, ἐπτακαίδεκα διελθόντων ἐτῶν μετὰ τὴν ἐκβολὴν τῶν βασιλέων. The only exceptions are in Dionysius, 1.74.5, where from τῶν καλουμένων τιμητικῶν ὑπομνημάτων, preserved by members of illustrious censorial families, the census of 393 was dated ὑπατεύοντος Λευκίου Οὐαλερίου Ποτίτου καὶ Τίτου Μαλλίου Καπιτωλίνου, μετὰ τὴν ἐκβολὴν τῶν βασιλέων ἐνὸς δέοντι εἰκοστῷ ἔτει and in Varro, *R.R.* 1.2.9, who dates the tribunate of Licinius in this way: *C. Licinius, tr. pl. cum esset, post reges exactos annis CCCLXV* (cf. L.R. Taylor, *Roman Voting Assemblies*, 1966, 25). The sentence, and also the explanation of the surname Stolo which precedes it, somewhat interrupts the flow of Varro's Latin and of his thought, and two glosses may have been incorporated in the text, possibly from elsewhere in Varro. Varro may also be the source of the antiquarian account of the quaestorship in Tacitus, *Ann.* 11.22, which has Valerius Potitus and Aemilius Mamercus first elected to an originally regal office *sexagesimo tertio anno post Tarquinius exactos*.

But these three instances, in Dionysius, Varro and Tacitus, are sufficient to validate the era (W. Kubitschek, *RE* 1.1 [1893], 625). It was more directly related to the Fasti than the era A.U.C., and did not require an agreed date for the Foundation of Rome. But it seems to have been superseded, perhaps for ideological reasons, by the other, which became fairly general in the early Empire (e.g. Pliny, *Natural History*) except in historical writing, which retained, as had Livy, the annalistic style of narrative chronology. The era p.r.e. survived, however, for events of the very early Republic.

It is remarkable that Eutropius uses it for the first 18 years of the Republic (1.10 *fuere igitur anno primo, regibus expulsis, consules*, 11 *secundo quoque anno*, 12 *nono anno post reges exactos*, 13 *sexto decimo anno post reges exactos*, 15 *octavo decimo anno post electos reges*) and then, after one consular date (16 *Caesone Fabio et Tito Virginio consulibus*), first introduces an A.U.C. date for the decemvirate (18 *anno trecentesimo et altero ab urbe condita imperium*

¹⁰ As noted by C. Meier, *Res publica amissa*, 1966, 203 n.6, who cites also Cicero, *rep.* 5.1, and Sallust, *Cat.* 14.1, for the concept of age and degeneration. Cf. also 7.25.9 *adeo in quae laboramus sola crevimus, divitias luxuriamque*.

¹¹ The millennial overtones of this speech, recognized by RMO on 4.4.4 *in aeternum urbe condita*, are too readily rejected by P.G. Walsh, *PACA* 4 (1961), 31. It is not always easy to distinguish Livy's own *Tendenz* from that of his sources.

consulare cessavit, et pro duobus consulibus decem facti sunt qui summam potestatem haberent). He does not record the institution of military tribunes in 444: instead he attributes it to A.U.C. 365, for him the year after the Sack, at the beginning of his second book, with the words *anno trecentesimo quinto ab urbe condita, post captam autem primo*¹², *dignitates mutatae sunt, et pro duobus consulibus facti tribuni militares consulari potestate*. This marks the growth of Roman power under Camillus: *hinc iam coepit Romana res crescere* (cf. 2.8 on the Samnite Wars: *iam Romani potentes esse coeperunt*). But Eutropius has four years of anarchy followed by three more years of Military Tribunes (2.3 *verum dignitas tribunorum militarium nondiu perseveravit. nam post aliquantum nullos placuit fieri, et quadriennium ita in urbe fluxit, ut potestates ibi maiores non essent resumpserunt tamen tribuni militares consulari potestae iterum dignitatem, et triennio perseveraverunt. rursus consules facti*). His source locates the anarchy where Diodorus did, and not where Livy did, who has four colleges after it (6.36.3; 36.6; 38.2; 42.3), but has already extended it to four years. The first consuls mentioned by Eutropius are L Genucius and Q Servilius (2.4, with the death of Camillus; Livy 7.1.7-10), but however tempting it might be to suppose that his source did not have the college of 367, Aemilius and Sextius, and regarded Genucius and Servilius as the first consuls of the Restoration (cf. *Military Tribunes* [n.2], p.69), the temptation should probably be resisted.

Eutropius' chronology might, however, support the hypothesis that Livy's 365th year (5.54.5) was originally that of the rebuilding of the city (cf. *secunda origo*, 6.1.3) and not that of the Sack. Eutropius' source here is certainly not Livy, but his ignorance of the early history of the military tribunate suggests that with Book 2 he switched to one which only started in that year, most likely therefore Claudius Quadrigarius, Livy's probable second source for Books 6 to 10. *These notes will be continued, but not necessarily every month.*

Copyright © 1988 J.Pinsent

JOHN GLUCKER (Tel Aviv): *As has been rightly said . . . by me*

LCM 13.1(Jan.1988), 6-9

Towards the end of *de officiis* (3.121), Cicero writes to his son: . . . *sed ut, si ipse uenissem Athenas, quod quidem esset factum, nisi me e medio cursu clara uoce patria reuocasset, aliquando me quoque audires e.q.s..* A parallel passage from a letter written about the same time, as well as some of the background, are supplied in a note on this sentence in the only full-length modern commentary on *de officiis*, that of A.S.Holden¹:

Cp. *ad fam.*X.I.1, *postquam de medio cursu reip. sum voce revocatus*. When Cicero found himself no longer secure in his country seat, and did not know which party to join, he set sail for Greece on the 17th July B.C. 44, but the wind drove his vessel back ashore. There he received intelligence of a change in political affairs, and heard that the stronger party did not approve of his voyage and also that M.Brutus invited him to work at Rome in the interest of his party; accordingly, he returned to Rome.

The full text of *ad fam.*10.1.1 - a letter to Plancus written about the middle of September 44 -

¹²The Sack was also used by Fabius' *Latin Annals* (Gellius 5.4.3, *Military Tribunes* p.11) to date the first plebeian consul: *quapropter tum primum ex plebe alter consul factus est, duovicesimo [duo et vicesimo MSS] anno postquam Roman Galli ceperunt*. Livy dates the patrician consular college of 355 in a similar way, in addition to an A.U.C. date, at 7.18.1 *quinto tricesimo quam a Gallis recipiata, ablato post undecimum annum a plebe consulatu patricii consules ambo ex interregno magistratum iniere, C.Sulpicius Peticus tertium M.Valerius Publicola*. Walters and Conway, in their *OCT* of 1919, bracket from *patricii* as a gloss (see their apparatus) avoiding the repetition of the consuls names from 7.13. But a source change may be the explanation. The *Latin Annals* might be his immediate or mediated source, with strong patrician bias, but the interval of 35 years and the form of reference, which echoes the form of the A.U.C dating, *quam urbs Romana condita erat*, are his own.

¹M.Tulli Ciceronis *De Officiis Libri Tres*, with introduction, analysis and commentary by the Rev. Hubert Ashton Holden, . . . Seventh Edition, Cambridge 1891, p.405. Exactly the same note appears in Holden's edition, with commentary, of *de off.*III, 7th Edition, Cambridge 1888, p.133 (= New Edition, 1898, and reprints, p.185).

runs as follows:

et afui proficiscens in Graeciam et, postea quam de medio² cursu rei publicae voce sum reuocatus, numquam per M. Antonium quietus fui . . .

To his son (and readers of *de officiis*) and to Plancus, Cicero can proclaim that Rome herself had called him back in the midst of his journey to Greece. To Brutus, who would take no such nonsense from him, he has to tell the more prosaic (though still embellished and dramatized) truth:

. . . in medio Achaico cursu cum etesiarum diebus Auster me in Italiam quasi dissuasor mei consilii retulisset . . . *ad Brut. 1.15.5*

Even the wind which drives a ship back to the shores of Italy is no mere natural phenomenon when this ship carries Cicero and his fortunes. But the clear voice of the Republic herself calling Cicero back home is a far more potent - almost poetical - image. Almost poetical?

In their comment on *fam. 10.1.1*, Tyrell and Purser³ write:

This personification of the State is found elsewhere in Cicero. In *Cat. i*, 27-29, he introduces the State, addressing him in a long speech, and then continues
his ego sanctissimis rei publicae vocibus . . . pauca respondebo.

But this is very far from being the whole story of the very special relation between Cicero and the Republic personified. At the end of a long speech from Book II of *de consulatu*, quoted by Cicero himself (*de div. 2.11-22* = Morel, *FPL*, Cicero 11, pp. 68-71), having described Cicero's philosophical studies in Athens, the Muse Urania continues:

*e quibus ereptum primo iam a flore iuuentae
te patria in media uirtutum mole locauit.*

ereptum is a strong expression - as if Cicero himself would have wished to stay on in Greece a moment longer than his health required. Nor are we told here that the Republic had snatched him away *de medio cursu*: only that she had placed him in *media uirtutum mole*. But *cursus* are mentioned in another fragment - this time from Book III of *de consulatu* (*Att. 2.3.4* = Morel, *FPL*, Cicero 13, p. 71), where the Muse Calliope has now taken over from her sister Urania:

*interea cursus, quos prima a parte iuuentae
quosque adeo consul uirtute animoque petisti,
hos retine atque auge famam laudesque bonorum.*

Obviously the same *cursus*, whether they had been undertaken *primo iam flore iuuentae* or *prima a parte iuuentae*: one has, after all, to keep one's obligations to the scansion of the hexameter. But the general picture is clear: the youthful and dedicated philosopher had been forcibly abducted from his studies by no lesser a person than the Republic herself, and put in the midst of a new and burdensome *cursus honorum*, from which he is not to swerve for the rest of his life - all to the greater glory, not of himself, of course, but of the rather familiar *boni* of his political creed.

There is, however, a much closer parallel to our passages of 44 B.C. in a speech delivered soon after Cicero's return from exile in 56 B.C. - *pro Sestio* 52:

. . . uidetis me tamen in meam pristinam dignitatem breui tempore doloris interiecto rei publicae uoce esse reuocatum.

That Cicero would employ the same imagery of the Republic's voice calling him to return home on two different occasions and in three different passages - this might have been merely the result of a trained rhetorical memory. But the same verb, *reuoco*, occurs also in two other passages celebrating Cicero's glorious return from exile:

sed cum uiderem me non diutius quam ipsam rem publicam ex hac urbe afuturum, neque ego illa exterminata mihi remanendum putavi, et ille, simul atque reuocata esset, me secum pariter reportauit . . .

post red. in Sen. 34

. . . at me in patriam ter suis decretis Italia cuncta reuocauit

post red. in Quir. 10

² The MSS have *de emo cursus*: *medio* is an emendation by Paulus Manutius - see his edition, *M. Tullii Ciceronis Epistolae Familiares* . . . Paulus Manutius Aldi F., Venetiis MDXL, scholia ad loc (*Ex epistola I Libri X*, pag. 143) - relying on our passage of *de off.* and on *ad Brut. 1.15.5*. R.D. Shackleton Bailey, *Cicero, Epistulae ad Atticum*, vol. II, Cambridge 1977, p. 479, on 10.1.1, call this 'an almost certain emendation'.

³ *The Correspondence of M. Tullius Cicero*, ed. R.Y. Tyrrell and L.C. Purser, vol. VI, Second Edition, Dublin & London 1933, p. 5, note on *medio*.

This seems to be more than a mere repetition of a fortuitous expression - all the more so if we bear in mind the Republic's special relation to Cicero, *primo iam a flore iuuentae*, which appears to find its most authentic expression in recalling him to Rome and his *cursus honorum* whenever he attempts to escape to Greece. But we have not yet reached the end of our story. When, during the final stages of Cicero's exile, Clodius fell out with Caesar and wanted the Senate to rescind Caesar's decrees, he employed a rather picturesque expression concerning his willingness to let Cicero return now from exile if the Senate were to comply with his request:

tua denique omnis actio posterioribus mensibus fuit. omnia quae C. Caesar egisset, quod contra auspicia essent acta, per senatum rescindi oportere; quod si fieret, dicebas te tuis umeris me custodem urbis in urbem relaturum de domo 40

This was not to happen: Cicero himself saw to it. When he did return to Rome, it was his old friend the Republic - who else? - who carried him back on her shoulders. Or rather, this time, the roles were divided, and the actual act of carrying - since it was decreed by a crowded *comitia centuriata* - was accomplished by 'the whole of Italy':

qua re, cum me uestra auctoritas arcessierit, populus Romanus uocauit, res publica implorauit, Italia cuncta paene suis umeribus reportauit . . . post red. in Sen. 39 (cf. Italia cuncta reuocauit in post red. in Quir. 10, quoted above)

This image of Italy carrying Cicero back on her shoulders was already well known to the author of the invective against Cicero ascribed to Sallust (Ps. Sall., in Cic. 7 = Morel, FPL, Cicero 21, p. 73):

sed quid ego plura de tua insolentia commemorem? quem Minerua omnis artes edocuit, Iuppiter optimus maximus in concilium deorum admisit, Italia exulem umeris suis reportauit.

The last words of this passage are almost exactly the same as those of Cicero himself. The context is important. We know from a letter to Quintus (Q. fr. 3.1.24 = Morel, FPL, Cicero 21, p. 73) that the council of the gods to which Cicero was admitted by Jove himself was depicted by him in Book II of *de temporibus suis*, a poem written between 56 and 54 B.C.⁴ The two first stories reported by Ps.-Sallust - that of the council of the gods and that of the tutorial activities of Minerva - are also recounted in the same breath, in the same order, and in very similar words by Quintilian (11.1.24 = Morel, FPL, Cicero 212, p. 73):

. . . in carminibus utinam pepercisset quae non desierunt carpere maligni . . . Iouem illum, a quo in concilium deorum aduocetur et Mineruam, quae artes eum edocuit: quae sibi ille secutus quaedam Graecorum exempla permiserat.

Both stories are therefore ascribed by editors to Book II of *de temporibus suis*⁵.

In his context, Quintilian is only concerned with *exempla* in the Greek epic manner. But Ps.-Sallust mentions, together with these two divine episodes, also the story of Italy carrying Cicero on her own shoulders. We have seen Cicero himself using this image - most probably as an exercise in 'one-upmanship' on Clodius - in one of his speeches. Cicero's tendency to allude in his prose writings to phrases and images he had used in his poetry should be investigated more thoroughly than it has been - at least to my knowledge. I shall cite one example nearer home. In *pro Plancio* 52 Cicero addresses the defendant and says:

quae tibi ultro pater et maiores tui non consolandi tui gratia dicent, neque uero quo te liberent aliqua culpa, quam tu uereris ne a te suscepta uideatur, sed ut te ad istum cursum tenendum quem a prima aetate suscepisti cohortentur.

Plancus' father and ancestors must clearly have been familiar with that masterpiece of Latin poetry, the exhortation of the Muse Calliope to Cicero in Book III of *de consulatu*. Examples of this sort could be multiplied.

It seems more than merely probable that, just like the council of the gods and the tutorials with Minerva, the image of Italy carrying Cicero back home on her own shoulders appeared in one of the books (II?) of *de temporibus*. *de temporibus*, we remember, was composed between the years 56 and

⁴ See. e.g., W.W. Ewbank, *The Poems of Cicero, edited with an introduction and notes*, London 1933, pp. 16-19.

⁵ Morel, FPL, Cicero 20-21, p. 73, combining the evidence of Q. fr. 3.1.24 and 2.8.1 with that of Quintilian and Ps.-Sallust. See Orelli's posthumous edition, carried on by Baither and Halm, Zurich 1861, vol. IV, p. 1052, where Quintilian's version of these two episodes is cited as Testimonia 3 and 4.

54 (see n.4 above); and in a speech delivered in 56 (*pro Sestio* 52, quoted above, p.10), we also have the image of Cicero *rei publicae uoce . . . reuocatus*, a verb which occurs in two of his speeches *post reditum*, and an image which occurs in our two passages of the year 44. Would it be too far-fetched to suggest that the image of the Republic's voice calling on Cicero to return to Rome and his *dignitas* also made its appearance in *de temporibus suis*? A line like

de medio cursu patriae me uox reuocauit

may not be the most accomplished hexameter in the whole range of Latin literature: after all, it is only my own reconstruction *exempli gratia*. But would it be all that much inferior to

o fortunatam natam me consule Romam

or to

cedant arma togae, concedant laurea linguae?

If we follow this suggestion, we might be forgiven an attempt to reconstruct, from the cumulative imagery and phraseology of the Ciceronian passages quoted here, what may have been a scene in *de temporibus suis*, describing Cicero's exile and return. When the decree banishing Cicero was passed, the Republic herself was also banished (*exterminata, post red. in Sen.34*). Cicero did not consider it right to stay on in Rome without her, and took his course to Greece. But once the Republic was called back (*reuocata, ibid.*), she immediately called back (*reuocauit, post red. ad Quir.10; rei publicae uoce esse reuocatum, pro Sest.52*) her favourite Son - or Father: *semper hic erro* - and the whole of Italy came to carry him back on her shoulders (rather than leave this magnificent piece of pageantry to the plebeian shoulders of P.Clodius). Thus the Republic and Italy (who, one speculates, may even have been invited to the council of the gods to be given instructions in this matter) joined hands with Jupiter and Minerva as tutelary deities of Cicero's political career.

Cicero, of course, did not go to Greece of his own free will. He waited at or near Brundisium until it became clear to him that Italy, or even Malta, were no longer safe. Nor was he *in medio cursu* when he was recalled to Rome: he had been waiting impatiently in Dyrrachium for the call to reach him. His letters of the period make this perfectly clear, just as his speeches *post reditum* are full of the overwhelming joy of being in Italy and in Rome once again. Nor, for that matter, was Cicero in 79 so utterly absorbed in his philosophical studies in Athens - where he had gone, as a second-best, only for reasons of health - to make it necessary for him to be 'plucked out' of them 'in the first flower of youth' by the relentless and exacting Republic. But the Muses may be forgiven such minor inaccuracies; and, after all, how many learned politicians - then or now - would have admitted that the allurements of power and glory are stronger, for them, than all the wisdom and beauty of the Umbriferous Academy and Nitid Lyceum? Cicero at least, when forced to devote himself to literary pursuits, achieved in a few brief periods far more than many another 'self-sacrificing' literary politician in a whole lifetime of leisure. When, in his last months, life proved to be truer than fiction, and he was literally driven back to Italy in the midst of sailing to Greece, to hear the voice of the Republic, personified by Brutus, calling him back in to political life, he was naturally reminded of a similar episode described by him in *de temporibus suis*. The apostrophe to the young Cicero in *de officiis* and the passage in the letter to Plancus would be the most natural echoes of a poetic event which had now miraculously turned into a reality.

Copyright © 1988 John Glucker.

ROBERT PARKER (Oriental College, Oxford): *Were Spartan kings heroized?*

LCM 13.1(Jan.1988), 9-10

Yes, it has often been said, most recently by Paul Cartledge in an interesting study of the Spartan royal funeral (*Agesilaos*, LONDON 1987, 331-343). But the text that is cited as proof speaks of the Spartan kings as heroes only in an idiosyncratic sense, which does not show that they received continuing heroic honours after death. Xenophon has been describing the privileges enjoyed by kings while still alive. He continues (*Rep.Lac.15.8-9*):

αὐται μὲν οὖν αἱ τιμαὶ [οἱ] ζῶντι βασιλεῖ δέδονται, οὐδέν τι πολὺ ὑπερφέρουσαι τῶν ἰδωτικῶν· οὐ γὰρ ἐβουλήθη (sc. Λικουρῆος) οὔτε τοῖς βασιλεῦσι τυραννικὸν φρόνημα παραστήσαι οὔτε τοῖς πολίταις ἐμποιῆσαι τῆς δυνάμεως. αἱ δὲ τελευτήσαντι τιμαὶ βασιλεῖ δέδονται, τῇ δὲ βούλονται δηλοῦν οἱ Λικουρῆος νόμοι, ὅτι οὐχ ὡς ἀνθρώπους, ἀλλ' ὡς ἥρωας τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίων βασιλεῖς προτετιμήκασιν.

This is not a simple statement that the kings became heroes at death. Xenophon is making a claim about the valuation of the kings which underlies the Lycurgan constitution. The laws grant them a special status (*προτετιμήκασιν*), the real ground for which is that they are seen as heroes (presumably because of their divine descent, 15.2). During their lifetime, however, the basis for that special status is disguised and even their actual honours are strictly limited, to discourage pride and envy. Only after death is the reality revealed. That revelation occurs, of course, through the spectacular royal funeral, so strikingly described by Herodotus (6.58). Xenophon says of the funeral of Agis II, in a phrase that is the best commentary of this passage in *Rep. Lac.*, that the dead king *ἔτυχε σεμνοτέρας ἢ κατὰ ἄνθρωπον ταφῆς* (*Hell.* 3.1.1). Xenophon thus emerges as an unexpected ancestor of that tradition of sociological analysis (cf. Cartledge, loc. cit.) which sees the funeral as an occasion *par excellence* for the symbolic representation of the realities (or fictions) of power. But though the funeral proves in Xenophon's eyes that the kings have been in a certain sense heroes all along, he does not claim that they continued to be honoured as heroes in the more normal, cultic sense.

Nothing in the slight further evidence shows that they were honoured so, in general, whatever may have been true of outstanding individuals such as Leonidas (cf. W.R.Connor, *TAPA* 109 [1979], 21-27. Even this case is unclear). There is no reason to take *τῷ δαίμονος* in Alcman 5 fr.2 col.i 13 Page as a dead Spartan king rather than a god. It is true that, unlike the majority of Spartiates (Plutarch, *Lyc.* 27), the kings were buried in permanent, identifiable monuments which could have served as a focus for continuing cult; Pausanias, however, speaks of these not as *ἡρώα* but simply as *τάφοι* or *μνήματα* (3.12.8 & 14.2-3).

Copyright © 1987 Robert Parker.

H.D.JOCELYN (Manchester): *Valerius Flaccus and Ennius*

LCM 13.1(Jan.1988), 10-11

C.Valerius Flaccus Setinus Balbus was educated at a time when the poets of the third and second centuries B.C. were ignored by schoolmasters. Presumably there was a copy of Ennius' *Annales* in Valerius' library, but the *Argonautica* gives no sign that he had read the Republican epic. G.B.A.Fletcher ought not therefore to have censured P.Langen's commentary for failing to cite Ennius at 1.539 and 4.660 (*LCM* 12.9 [Nov.1987], 132-5).

If we are seeking the verbal source of 1.537-9 *iam pridem regio, quae uirginis aequor ad Helles | et Tanai tenus immenso descendit ab Euro, | undat equis*, then Virgil, *Georg.* 2.437 *et iuvat undantem buxo spectare Cytorum* is a better candidate than Ennius, *Ann.* 316 *praeda exercitus undat*. Ennius represented the unsteady progress of the booty-laden army by means of a fresh and striking image. With Virgil, on the other hand, we get a fading poeticism, one destined to fade still further in the hands of Valerius.

At 4.660 *flamma expresso bis fulsit in imbri* Valerius used *imber* of sea-water. The *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, vol.VII i, fasc.3 (Leipzig 1936), p.423.4-8, assembles the relevant parallels: Ennius, *Ann.* 515-16 *ratibusque fremebat | imber Neptuni*, Virgil, *Aen.* 1.122-3 *omnes (sc. naues) | accipiunt inimicum imbrem*, Ovid, *Ars am.* 3.224 *Venus madidas exprimit imbre comas* (missed by Fletcher as well as by Langen - Augustus must be pleased), *Epist.* 18.104 *et madidam siccas aequoris imbre comam*, *Pont.* 4.1.29-30 *Venus . . . | aequoreo madidas quae premit imbre comas*. Again the novelty and power of an Ennian locution strike the ear: *imber* normally belonged to *Iuppiter* and his portion of the world (cf. Ennius, *Var.* 54-6; Terence, *Eun.* 584-5; Lucretius 1.250-51) rather than to *Neptunus* and his. What Valerius, however, took up was another faded Augustan poeticism.

For other Valerian passages parallels from the *Annales* can be cited which are equally close but not at all more significant: for 1.48 *cum serus fessos sopor alligat artus*, for example, *Ann.* 2 *somno leni placidoque reuinctus*. Here Langen cited Cl.Marius Victor, *Aleth.* 3.438 *fessos dulcis sopor alligat artus*, a clear verbal imitation and thus important for the history of the transmission of Valerius' poem. Fletcher prefers to draw attention to the chronologically prior Seneca, *Contr.* exc.10.6 *ministros . . . alligauerat somnus*. In its systematic way the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, vol.I, fasc.8 (Leipzig 1905, p.1683.76-9 places 1.48 in a sequence beginning with Seneca, *Herc.f.* 1079 (not *Herc.O.* 1074) *sopor indomitos alligat artus*. More interesting, however, than the particular use of the verb *alligare* is the whole field of metaphor. From epic

might be cited: Homer, *Od.* 23.16-17 ἐξ ὕπνου ἀνέγειρε, ἡδέος, ὅς μ' ἐπέδρησε, Ennius, *Ann.* 2 *somno leni placidoque reuinctus*, Lucretius 4.453-4 *suavi deuinxit membra sopore | somnus*, 1027 *somnoque deuincti*. Ovid, *Met.* 11.238 *somno uinctas iacebas*; from the related genre of tragedy, Sophocles, *Aias* 675-6 ἐν δ' ὁ παγκρατὴς ὕπνος | λυεῖ πεδήσας, Seneca, *Herc.f.* 1079 *sopor indomitos alligat artus*.

A careful sifting of Greek and Latin literature would doubtlessly extend these lists and create others, but it seems reasonable to assert that Valerius was taking up a long-established cliché of his own genre. The rhetor reported by the elder Seneca, on the other hand, had been carried momentarily into grandiose metaphorical language: *proditoris uigilantissimum pectus et in exitia semper nostra sollicitum publica fata sopierant; ita etiam ministros eius alligauerat somnus, ut mihi liceret eligere quod tollerem*. What particular poem stimulated Valerius we cannot say. Several epics of the Augustan period still read in his day are now lost.

Copyright © 1988 H.D.Jocelyn

Review: W.GEOFFREY ARNOTT (Leeds)

LCM 13.1 (Jan. 1988), 11-13

Graham Zanker, *Realism in Alexandrian poetry: a literature and its audience*. London / Sydney/Wolfeboro N.H., Croom Helm, 1987. Pp.vi + 250. Cloth, £29.95. ISBN 0-7099-3055-4

In the last four years students of Hellenistic poetry have been intellectually enriched (if financially impoverished) by a wealth of indispensable works: the Parsons and Lloyd-Jones *Supplementum Hellenisticum* (Berlin / New York 1983), the editions with commentaries of Callimachus' fifth and sixth hymns by Bulloch and Hopkinson respectively (Cambridge 1985 and 1984), Mineur's commentary on the *Hymn to Delos* (Leiden 1984), and Bulloch's impressive and innovative survey of Hellenistic poetry in *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature I* (1985), 541-621. Zanker's fine study of realism in Alexandrian poetry stands worthily by the side of these.

Its author is an Australian whose doctoral studies were supervised by the late L.P.Wilkinson in Cambridge, before Zanker (hereafter Z.) went on to teach at the University of Canterbury in New Zealand and to provide his own testimony to the creative vigour of classical scholarship in Australasia. His book is a model of logical organization, perceptive and sensible, well argued and showing a full command of the relevant scholarship in all its many fields. Its importance seems to me primarily to derive from the way in which Z. draws together some familiar ideas, adds to them a series of new insights, and places them all convincingly together in a crisp perspective, producing a unified picture out of disparate elements which are now cogently related to each other and to the whole. It is a picture of Alexandrian poetry to which I am admittedly sympathetic (cf. my paper on Lycidas in Theocritus' seventh idyll, *Estudios Clasicos* 87 [1984], 333-346, which perhaps appeared too late for Z.'s bibliography), but my high regard for this book is in no way affected by that fact; of this I am all the more confident because of the excellent reception already given to several papers published by Z. as cockshies of detailed investigations related to individual sections of this volume: *ἐνάρχεια*, *RhMus* 124 (1981), 297-311; Callimachus' *Hecale*, *Antichthon* 11 (1977), 68-77; aspects of realism, *Antike und Abendland* 29 (1983), 125-145; the walk in Theocritus VII, *CQ ns* 30 (1980), 373-7; the love theme in the *Argonautica*, *Wien.Stud.* 13 (1979), 52-75.

Z.'s opening chapter defines his terms and exemplifies his methods. By 'Alexandrian poetry' Z. means first and foremost the movement of which Callimachus was the main figure, a movement (as Ziegler pointed out over fifty years ago in *Das hellenistische Epos*) of short duration and unrepresentative of the mass of poetry churned out at the time, however influential it became later in Rome. After marking some familiar features of Alexandrian poetry (erudition, *imitatio cum uariatione* of earlier poets like Homer, allusiveness and irony) Z. claims a further unifying characteristic: the 'desire to bring poetry into . . . contact with sensory, intellectual and emotional experience'. He argues for an emphasis which (particularly in the treatment of myth) seeks to achieve a sort of modern credibility, whether the function be serious, comic or ironic. Z. exemplifies these claims persuasively by an analysis of Theocritus XV, although his high regard for the hymn to Aphrodite and Adonis encapsulated in it (cf. Bulloch, *CHCL* I.580) is not shared by everybody (cf. *CR ns* 36 [1986], 251). The audience for such idylls, as Z. correctly observes, did not

consist of the Gorgos and Praxinoas of contemporary Alexandria, but of an upper-class intellectual elite who felt dislocated by their settlement on top of an alien civilization and needed desperately to maintain their links with the mainstream of Greek culture.

Z. goes on to survey the theory and practice of pictorial realism in the art and literary criticism of the period. The key word in Hellenistic times was *ἐνάργεια*, the vivid portrayal of events, scenes and objects which at its most successful creates the illusion that a reader or listener can actually see what is being described. Z. analyses this and other terms (*ἐκφρασις*, *φαντασία*) clearly and precisely with total command of his material, before proceeding to exemplify Alexandrian practice in describing works of art. He may be right to argue that the *κισσίβιον* of Theocritus I is a totally imaginary object, based on no cup that ever existed in real life, but it is dangerous (and also misleading) to use here as supporting evidence the point (admittedly not originated by Z.) that in the Theocritean vignettes the woman and the fox are described as moving, which would allegedly be impossible on a real, rigid work of art. Anybody who has looked carefully at the Flaxman-Storr vase in Liverpool, which was designed as a realization of the Theocritean description, knows how skilled artists can give the impression of movement on a static surface (cf. *Quad.Urb.* 29 [1978], 129-134, with plates).

The third chapter of Z.'s book, which investigates the techniques used to achieve pictorial realism in Alexandrian literature, is shot through with fine aperçus, particularly when it highlights the vivid, individualizing detail in Callimach's (an application very close to what Charles Dickens called 'feeling the story to its minutest point'), or when it shows how Apollonius of Rhodes added to his epic sources a load of pictorial minutiae from contemporary observation in order to bring the myth into line with the audience's own experience. Z. seems to me a little less successful with Theocritus' evocation of 'precise mental images', where his interpretation of the realistic portrayal of Lycidas the goatherd in idyll VII is perhaps hampered rather than helped by his adhesion to the theory that this goatherd is Apollo in disguise (Williams, *CQ* ns21 [1971], 137-145). My own belief (cf. *Estudios Clasicos* 87 [1984], 333-346) that here Theocritus gives Lycidas some divine features without actually deifying him, would in fact suit one of Z.'s general theories about the Alexandrian approach to myth and earlier literature rather better: by removing the distancing effect of the less realistic and less credible versions of tradition, and substituting the human level of everyday life.

Z. turns next to scientific erudition in Hellenistic poetry, where the use of researched technicalities can be used 'to confer immediacy and credibility' on its material provided the audience itself is erudite enough to understand the niceties. The author identifies four main forms and functions in this appeal to science: (1) investigation by the Alexandrian poets of the variant myth traditions in order to select the most plausible version; (2) underpinning a myth with precise geographical references and details; (3) proving the validity of a tradition by aetiological evidence; and (4) the general use of medical (as well as other scientific) expertise in poetry of the period. This quartet of forms and functions is abundantly illustrated by Z. from the whole gamut of Alexandrian verse; thus the Acontius and Cydippe episode in the third book of Callimachus' *Aetia* admirably exemplifies the first point, and the description of the Mossynoeci in Apollonius' *Argonautica*, 2.379ff. and 1018ff., with equal appropriateness the second.

Even so, a reviewer must express some reservations about Z.'s treatment of this area of his subject. He takes the material for his first point largely from Callimachus and Apollonius, claiming that it is these two poets in particular who may be seen to select the most credible version of a myth, but Theocritus 'less so'. Yet the Theocritean treatment of the same Daphnis legend in idyll I can be viewed in exactly the same light and with the same function, especially if one accepts the interpretation put forward first by Prescott (*CQ* 7 [1915], 176ff.) and later developed by Heather White (*Ant.Class.* 46 [1977], 578f. and 47 [1978], 165ff.), which makes the story of Daphnis' death by drowning more plausible and realistic for an Alexandrian audience than any of the rival interpretations, such as the one based on a vow of chastity which Z. favours.

Again, Theocritus' seventh idyll beautifully exemplifies the importance of topographical precision, as both Z. (*CQ* ns30 [1980], 373ff.) and I (*Quad.Urb.* 32 [1979], 99ff.) have on earlier occasions independently argued, but one area of scientific expertise that this and other idylls reveal is almost entirely neglected by Z.: expertise on natural history. On p.82 Z. refers to 'the unique visual information about the countryside' that the pastoral idylls supply, but nowhere in Z.'s book is there a detailed analysis of the remarkably accurate portrayal of the wild life and

plants that form part of the backcloth in these poems. I have discussed the authenticity of Theocritus' picture of Coan wild life in the *Estudios Clasicos* article mentioned above; fifty years ago Alice Lindsell in a paper ignored by Z. (*G&R* 6 [1937], 78ff.) clearly demonstrated Theocritus' botanical expertise, although the consequences of her argument that the flora is always (even in those idylls whose scene is Sicily or South Italy) an east-Mediterranean one have recently been reinterpreted (cf. K.Lembach, *Die Pflanzen bei Theocrit* [Heidelberg 1970], 12f. n.6). Was it perhaps after leaving Syracuse and reaching Cos that the poet learnt his plants, perhaps at the medical school on the island?

The fifth chapter discusses the theories about, and the practice of, realism in pre-Alexandrian authors. Z. begins by stressing the tendency of earlier literature to prescribe and follow rules linking form and content; thus the epic metre was normally reserved for serious subjects, and in tragedy the leading characters were the aristocratic leaders of myth and history. The Alexandrians on the other hand preferred to ignore such rules, mixing genres and (for instance) making ordinary people (like Hecale) take central roles in serious poetry. This chapter is well researched, argued and judged; Z. is quite aware of the apparent exceptions to the general rule (e.g. Eumaeus and Eurycleia in the *Odyssey*, the farmer married to the heroine of Euripides' *Electra*), and the evidence is not pushed further than it will go.

The last main section of the book is devoted to a full and sensitive survey of the 'everyday and low' in Alexandrian poetry. Z. stresses two aspects of Herodas' mimes: their comic intention and the clash between the author's vulgar subjects and his *recherché* form, dialect and glosses; there is also, it seems to me, a prurient voyeurism linked to the vulgarity. On Theocritus Z. has some very useful comments on metrical, linguistic and social aspects of his theme, but when he calls attention (he is of course not the first to do so) to the absence of any reference in idyll V to the wars and unrest that plagued at this time the south-Italian countryside of its setting, can we really be sure that this was a deliberate omission? If Theocritus left Sicily early in life and wrote most of his poetry in Cos and Alexandria, the historical events involving Croton and Sybaris could well have passed him by or at least weighed less heavily on his mind. Z.'s discussion of idylls VI and XI would have been more pointed if he had observed that their 'humanizing' of Polyphemus was a feature also of Hellenistic art, which even portrayed him at times as an unhappy young man with two normal eyes (cf. S.Nicosia, *Teocrito e l'arte figurata* [Palermo 1968], 65ff. and plates VII to IX: this work is a major omission from Z.'s otherwise excellent bibliography). Z. has some important things to say about Callimachus' deglamorization of myth heroes and creation of an '*Idyll der Kleinwelt*' (Herter's memorable phrase, while his analysis of the *Hecale* provides the best interpretation of its titular heroine known to me. Z. is less original on the *Argonautica*, although his comments on Jason as an ordinary - man hero who prefers diplomacy to old-style heroics and on sexual passion as the motive force behind the mission's success are no less valid for all that.

A brief envoi sums up the findings of this valuable study, identifying the effects that Alexandrian poetry sought, recognizing that realism is only one aspect of that poetry, and claiming a new unity behind the *ποικίλα*.

I close with a selection of comments on details. Pages 14-25: on Theocritus XV.101 Z. rightly follows Vollgraf's interpretation of χρυσῶ παλζοις 'Ἀφροδίτα, but there is more to be said about this phrase; cf. my paper in *Studi offerti a F.Della Corte*, forthcoming. 43: Z. subscribes to the commonly held view that the scene of Herodas IV is Cos, but see Cunningham, *CQ* ns16 (1966), 115ff., and his edition of the *Mimiambi* (Oxford 1971), *ad loc.* 48 On Ap.Rhod.I.1229ff., Z. correctly translates διχόμηνης as 'full moon' but later on the page misremembers this as 'half moon'. 52 n.32, cf. 86 and 109 n.123: on the statue of the boxer in the Terme Museum at Rome see also Nicosia, *op.cit.* 55ff.. 82, cf. 107 n.99 and 119ff.: Z. holds on to the identification of the Coan spring Bourina (mentioned in Theocr.VII.7ff.) as one that wells up a kilometre south of the Asclepieion (cf. his article, *CQ* ns30 [1980], 373ff.), in opposition to those who argue for a different location (e.g. Linopóti, cf. *Quad.Urb.* 32 [1979], 102ff.). I am now inclined to think that Z. may be right. 161ff.: in discussing instances of everyday realism in Hellenistic epigrammatists, Z. omits to mention one of the cleverest exploitations: Asclepiades XV Gow-Page, where the increasing number of syllables in the words of the last line appear to mimic the stages in the game of δαστράγαλοι that is being described (cf. McKay, *Mnemosyne* 21 [1968], 173f.).

Reviews: GILLIAN CLARK (Liverpool): 'Sex and violence'

LCM 13.1(Jan.1988), 14-46

Nicole Loraux, *Tragic ways of killing a woman*, edited and translated by Anthony Forster, Cambridge, Mass., and London, Harvard U.P. 1987. Pp.xii + 100. \$17.95. ISBN 0-674-90225-4

Nicole Loraux follows her work on Athenian funeral orations, the public consideration of the deaths of men, with a study of the public presentation of the deaths of women, that is, in Athenian tragedy. She starts from the fact that such deaths are presented not as spectacle, but in words. She presupposes an ideal listener, attentive, aware of the depths and resonances of the text, 'with resources of memory such as we no longer command' (p.viii): such a listener may be fiction, not history, but the fiction is necessary to those now confronted with the text. Loraux herself is an exceptionally good listener (it is a female virtue). She hears clearly words it is all too easy to blur. Yet another death-scene, murmurs the common reader, more two-edged swords and compound adjectives - but the death-scenes repay exact attention.

Women in tragedy often threaten, or enact, death by the rope or the sword. It matters which they choose, for in enduring the sword-stroke they manifest *ἀνδρεία*. The location of the death-wound also matters. A blow to the neck may enter the *αὔχην* or the *δέρη*. The *αὔχην* is the nape, the *δέρη* the vulnerable throat, where the sacrificer strikes his victim. A man typically dies in battle, preferably from the wound of sword or spear which proves hand-to-hand combat; a male suicide sinks his sword in the side or the liver. Some women in tragedy attempt the warrior's death (a note on p.88 remarks that women in Latin literature generally choose the sword). Eurydike in *Antigone*, 'all mother', strikes herself below the liver, having heard how her son drove his sword through his ribs, and dies at the domestic altar (1236, 1315-16); whereas Antigone is forced to choose the typical female death, hanging herself in a linen noose (her headband?) in the rock tomb which has become her *θάλαμος*. Deianeira in *Trachiniae* unpins her dress to expose her left side and arm, and strikes her side below the liver and diaphragm not because Sophocles is being vague about livers, but because the left is the female side, and Deianeira's manly death (in her *θάλαμος*, on her marriage bed) is pulled back into femininity. In this second example Loraux has to assume the ideal listener's awareness of the equation of left and female, as elsewhere for the link between throat and cervix (p.61), which is not made explicit in tragedy. She may well be right about Deianeira's death-wound: that admirable woman fails to overcome, by the female virtue of *σωφροσύνη*, her female resentment of a rival in the house, and through ignorance and deep feeling commits the typical female murder, by poison and a gift of clothing. The death would fit.

Loraux is also illuminating about sacrificed virgins. Polyxena in *Hekabe* refuses to be seized and lifted above the altar, a helpless victim like Iphigeneia in *Agamemnon*: she bares her own throat for the death-blow and goes down on one knee, remaining in contact with the earth. But this also is not an unequivocally manly death, in which the *παρθένος* is equated with the warrior. Polyxena tears down her dress to the navel (so, one might add, she is still wearing her virgin *ζώνη*) and exposes *μαστούς* and *στέρνα*. She offers either *στέρνον* or *λαιμός* (the gullet, described as *ὑπ' αὔχην*) for the blow, not the vulnerable *δέρη*. But, as Loraux observes, *μαστός* is the mother's breast offering milk, and sometimes an erotic object (cf. Ar. *Lys.* 155-6; Eur. *Androm.* 629); *στέρνον*, like 'bosom' has more to do with emotion or with aesthetic effect, especially in the disfigurement of mourning (I should like to know, with L.'s own anatomical precision, what exactly the practice was in mourning. A peplos is so constructed that it would be difficult to uncover *δέρη* or *στέρνον* for laceration without uncovering *μαστούς*; and since male responses haven't changed much - see the passages collected by Douglas Gerber in *Arethusa* 11 (1978), 207 - the effect would not be gloomy). To return to Polyxena: not only is she visibly female in her manly death (like the fallen Amazon on black-figure pots), but the shedding of her blood in sacrifice makes her in some sense not a virgin, as though it were equated with bloodshed in defloration (pp.37-42: see further Helen King in *Images of Women in Antiquity*, ed. A.Cameron & A.Kuhrt, 1983).

These are three instances among many in which L.'s precise and honest observation illuminates a text. The awareness of her 'ideal listener' is formed by some quite recent work on Greek ritual and medicine, yet she does not seem to be imposing a structure: the effect is simply of one able to hear what the text actually says on matters which have been disregarded. Her own text is brief, but full of sentences and footnotes which might be (or will be) expanded into articles; it is also, except for a few strenuous moments in the preface and the concluding pages, straightforward and well translated. Her general conclusion is that Athenian tragedy does not, after all, make a

bold departure from Athenian beliefs about female nature. Tragedy makes a public statement about the violent deaths of women, whereas women in general died in their beds, slain by the gentle arrows of Artemis, and were mourned only by their families. Tragedy allows women glory. But a woman - wife or *παρτηένος* - can achieve the glory of women only by showing *ἀνδρεία*: there is no other word for it. Yet in showing *ἀνδρεία* she is always presented as female, even 'in an instant, in the time taken by one word' (p.63). The audience is edified and purified of emotions unsuited to the good citizen: and what emotions were those? The characteristically tragic ways of killing a woman are the suicide of wives and the sacrifice of virgins.

Michael B. Poliakoff, *Combat Sports in the Ancient World: competition, violence and culture*. Sport and History Series, New Haven & London, Yale U.P. Pp.xvi + 202, cloth, £16.95, \$30.00. ISBN 0-300-03768-6.

If anyone still believes in the honourable Olympic amateur, competing in fair fight for the glory and a wreath of culinary herbs, here is the knock-out blow. Combat sports in classical culture were evidently the continuation of war by other means (cf. Paul Cartledge in *Greek Religion and Society*, ed. P. Easterling and J. Muir [1985], ch.5). Admittedly, there were a few rules, enforced by trainers and referees armed with sticks. In wrestling (ch.2), touching your opponent's back or shoulders to the ground counted as a fall; wrestlers used chokeholds, kicks and trips, but were not supposed to gouge or to bend fingers back until they broke (one Olympic victor used the latter technique). Pankration fighters (ch.3) might not gouge or bite, except in local contests in Sparta where (we might have known) anything went. Romans were shocked by Greek athletic nudity, but it was the indecency, not the vulnerability, which worried them: genitals were not off limits. Boxing (ch.5) did the worst damage, and some boxers wore ear-protectors, but they also wore knuckle-dusters which inflicted cuts (one type was *χλεειδ μύρμηξ*, which suggests that the music parodied as 'ant-tracks' in Ar. *Thesm.* 100 was *musique concrète*). The Romans invented the appalling *caestus* (pp.75-9), which reached to the upper arm and was reinforced by spikes, serrated edges and lumps of metal. This is decidedly the video-nasty aspect of ancient culture. P. excludes gladiators, on the grounds (p.7) that there was an element of compulsion, and killing was the object rather than the frequent consequence: this is 'warfare for spectators'. On the evidence, this is not an easy distinction to make - and one might feel less repelled by gladiatorial contests with some more information on techniques and tactics (like the wrestling manuals P. illustrates). Ordinary non-warfare combat sports had no weight class, so competitors might hastily concede on seeing their opponent; no time limit except darkness; a draw which might confront a man in his third fight of the day with a rested opponent. No wonder training aimed at endurance, both of injuries and of heat.

So much for the fair fight; now for the honorable amateur. Most festivals offered cash prizes or the equivalent, so fighters could achieve their fortunes, as well as fame and free dinners in the town hall. Fighters came from a wide social range, though there was an economic barrier: it was not, as you might suppose, a matter of finding some level ground and stripping off. Combat sports on anything but the proper sand (imported, if necessary) or mud surface could cause major injury, so there was gymnasium membership and its fees to consider; massage oil was both essential and expensive. The locker-room culture characteristic of Hellenism required either status or a sponsor (cf. Iamblichus, *VP* 21).

Critics of combat sports objected not to the physical damage, or the moral corruption of the spectators, but to the high valuation of successful fighters (above intellectuals, that is). They also disputed whether combat sports really did prepare for war, except in terms of physical courage. P.'s quotations from Galen prompt a wish for more on medical discussions of injuries, body-building, exercise and diet (for instance, the high-protein vs. high fibre question, Iamb. *VP* 25). It is good to have Jewish and Christian critique. St. Ambrose does not leap to mind as a source on wrestling, but Church Fathers drew on combat sport for metaphors of the fight against sin, rather as their successors do on football. Nor, if asked to guess which ancient author has the greatest number of sporting metaphors, would one pick Philo (unless on the grounds that he must have the greatest number of almost anything).

The *Sport and History* series, which this volume inaugurates, is (I quote the jacket) 'designed to demonstrate that systematic study of sport as a fundamental human activity can illuminate the character of particular societies and of human nature itself'. This is a promising

line of enquiry, even to those who (like the reviewer) never read the sports reports. Who competes with whom, in what activities (why no fencing?), with what rewards and rules and penalties? What marks it as sport, who watches and what is the effect on them? Is there a religious or cathartic or political purpose? Dates in P.'s bibliography suggest that Sports History is another aspect of 1970s social history, getting a boost each (modern) Olympiad (see Erich Segal in *AJP* 107[1987], 536-40, for more theory and more evidence that this is a growth area). P.'s general conclusion, supported by historical survey and comparative anthropology, is that Greek society was indeed distinctively agonal, preoccupied with finding a winner; in the archaic period sport perhaps channelled the competitive impulses which made the hero a bad citizen. The level of violence, and risk of death, he relates to the prevalence of war - and, one might add, of unrelieved pain and hard physical labour (whereas the present liking for Oriental fighting techniques, which look - however deceptively - elegant, effortless and dependent on science not size, may be linked to our culture's ability to bypass brute effort and brute suffering, or at least to conceal the sufferers in the hands of professionals).

So one more for the *Sports* (or *Violence*) shelf, alongside Keith Hopkins on gladiators (in *Death and Renewal*, 1983) and, rather sadly, H.A.Harris on *Sport in Greece and Rome* (1972), which, so short a time ago, seems to belong to an age before well-publicized burn-out, anabolic steroids and rows with the referee. More social history there for someone. Finally, P. does not cite evidence for violence among spectators: perhaps combat sports are a better catharsis than team sports.

Copyright © 1988 Gillian Clark

D.N.Levin (Rice U., Houston): *Horace, Carm.3.1.42 again: a belated, but brief, rejoinder to Mr Nisbet.* LCM 13.1(Jan.1988), 16

Dissatisfied with the received text of the first 'Roman' Ode's penultimate stanza,
*quodsi dolentem nec Phrygius lapis
 nec purpurarum sidere clarior
 delenit usus, nec Falerna*

uitis Achaemeniumque costum. 41-44

R.G.M.Nisbet, in *LCM* 5.7 (Jul.1980), 151-2, neither follows those mss. which read *delenit* instead of *delenit* nor agrees with those which treat *uitis* not as nominative modified by *Falerna*, but as genitive modified by *Falernae* (sc. *Falernae uitis usus*?). What he does instead is to seek to re-establish symmetry and consistency by introducing an emendation of his own, as he rejects *sidere* (and yet he seems not offended by *sidere pulchrior* at *Carm.3.9.1*) in favour of *Sidone*.

So far, so good. Line 42, just as lines 41, 43 and 44, now displays its geographical allusion.

And yet I remain uneasy. Would Horace himself have countenanced the metrical distortion which seems not to bother his latter-day explicator? I think not. *Sidone clarior* might have been acceptable to a Silver-Latin poet such as Martial, which latter actually gives us both *Sidone tinctus olenti* (2.16.3) and *cultus Sidone non cotidiana* (11.1.2), but hardly to Augustus' perfectionist contemporary. Not even the more relaxed Ovid, who sometimes permits questionable syllabic shortenings in order to make his verses scan, has gone so far as to tamper metrically with the name of the celebrated Phoenician commercial centre. Witness his own *tum, cum Sidone profectus* (*Met.4.572*).

Copyright © 1988 D.N.Levin.

CORRIGENDA to *LCM* 12.9 (Nov.1987)

to 'Valerius Flaccus again' (references are to book and line number).

1.146, last reference should be Sen. *Ep.*58.2: 1.369-70, for *aequora* read *aequore*: 1.573, for *falentia* read *fallentia*; 1.681-2, add 'Cf. Luc.2.596 *uerba ducis nullo partes clamore sequuntur*'; 2.44 (fourth lemma on p.133) delete; 2.509, for 'sats' read 'says'; 3.220 add *implet* after the first *discursibus*; 3.395, for *mertus* read *metus*; 4.419-20, for *noimine* read *nomine* and for *nominare* read *nominauere*; 5.121, before *uoluens* add *murmura*; 5.442-3, before *Phari* add *laeta*; 6.88, for *aeratum* read *aeratam*; 6.629-30, for *aminis* read *animis*.

to the review of Hanson's *Agricola*,

p.140, para.4, A.C.King's paper extends only to p.217, not to p.2127 as printed!